REMARKS

In the Office Action of May 10, 2005, claims 59, 60, 63-66, 68-70, 72-76, and

78-83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jones et al.*

(US 2004/0254863, hereafter *Jones*). In the current response, claims 84 and 85 are

being added. Accordingly, claims 59, 60, 63-66, 68-70, 72-76, and 78-85 will be

pending in this application.

I.   Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 59, 60, 63-66, 68-70, 72-

76, and 78-83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Jones. The Applicants have amended claim 59, and as the rejection may be applied to

amended claim 59, respectfully traverse.

Amended claim 59 recites a computer implemented method for ordering and

tracking components required to assemble an asset for use in a particular data center

comprising a plurality of assets, the method comprising:

> creating an asset record for the asset designated for assembly,
> wherein the asset is comprised of a plurality of components,
> wherein creating the asset record comprises generating an asset
> identifier for the asset that is unique within the data center and
> distinguishes the asset from the plurality of assets in the data center;
> creating a purchase order for each of the plurality of
> components of the asset;
> storing the asset record and purchase order information in a
> management database, wherein the stored purchase order
> information is associated with the asset record in the management
> database;
> upon receiving the plurality of components along with
> information regarding the purchase orders of the components,
> retrieving and updating the asset record in the management database
> using the received purchase order information to reflect that the
> plurality of components have been received; and
> determining whether all components required for assembling
> the asset have been received,
> wherein each of the method steps are performed

automatically, without human intervention.

Jones does not teach, disclose, or even suggest each limitation of claim 59. For example, *Jones* does not teach, disclose, or even suggest creating an asset record for an asset comprised of a plurality of components, wherein creating the asset record comprises generating an asset identifier for the asset that is unique within a particular data center in which the asset is used and distinguishes the asset from a plurality of assets in the data center, creating a purchase order for each of the components of the asset, storing the asset record and purchase order information in a management database, retrieving and updating the asset record in the management database (upon receiving the components) to reflect that the components have been received, and determining whether all components required for assembling the asset have been received, wherein each of the method steps are performed automatically, without human intervention.

No where in *Jones* is it taught, disclosed, or even suggested that an asset identifier is generated for an asset where the asset identifier is <u>unique within a particular data center in which the asset is used</u> and <u>distinguishes the asset from a plurality of assets</u> in the data center, as required in claim 59. To generate such an asset identifier requires knowledge of the particular data center in which an asset is ultimately used and also knowledge of the other assets in the particular data center. Such knowledge is not taught or suggested in *Jones*. Further, no where in *Jones* is it taught, disclosed, or even suggested that such a unique asset identifier is generated for an asset <u>prior to the components of the asset even being received</u> for assembling the asset, as required in claim 59. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite the precise portion(s) of *Jones* that cite these limitations of amended claim 59.

For the above reasons, Applicants submit that claim 59 is in allowable form. Claims 60, 63-66, 68-70, and 72 are dependent, either directly or indirectly, on claim 59 and allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 59. Further, claim 69 requires that after the asset is assembled, the asset is deployed into the data center, the deployed asset being connected to a network, wherein the management database is also connected to the network. *Jones* further does not teach or suggest that an asset is connected with the <u>same</u> network with which the management database that stores the asset record for the asset is connected.

Amended independent claim 73 is a computer readable medium claim containing limitations similar to amended independent claim 59 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 59. Claims 74-76 and 78 are dependent on claim 73 and allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 73.

II.   New Claims 84 and 85

New claim 84 is dependent on claim 59 and allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 59. In addition, claim 84 further recites that the asset identifier for the asset is generated <u>based on the purchase orders</u> created for the components of the asset. Applicants submit that the further limitations of new claim 84 is not taught, disclosed, or even suggested in *Jones*.

New claim 85 is dependent on claim 73 and allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 73. Also, new claim 85 is a computer readable medium claim containing limitations similar to new claim 84 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 84.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP

Dated: <u>October 3, 2005</u>

Gregory Suh
Reg. No. 48,187

Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP
PO Box 51860
Palo Alto, CA 94303-0728
Phone: (650) 752-0990 ext.104
Fax: (650) 752-0995

Reference No.: 10007988-1
PTO Serial Number: 09/853,976